

RADOSŁAW KULINIAK

UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW, POLAND  
E-MAIL: KORNIK90@POCZTA.ONET.PL  
ORCID: 0000-0002-0090-6609

DOROTA LESZCZYNA

UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW, POLAND  
E-MAIL: D.LESZCZYNA@WP.PL  
ORCID : 0000-0001-5172-0911

## Genesis of the Polish translation of *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Present Itself as a Science*

**Abstract:** Immanuel Kant's critical philosophy made its presence in Polish philosophy at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century through translations of two works: the *Prolegomena* and the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The initiator of this undertaking was Henryk Struve, supported by Kazimierz Twardowski and Władysław Weryho. It was through the determination of these scholars that Polish philosophy assimilated Kant's most important works of critical philosophy. In a mere dozen or so years, the Polish philosophical community received translations of almost all of Kant's major works. This article presents the genesis of the emergence of the first Polish translation of the *Prolegomena*. It describes the issues faced by translators and editors, and points out the polemics and discussions sparked by the first Polish translation of the *Prolegomena*.

**Keywords:** Kant, Twardowski, Struve, *Prolegomena*, *Critique of Pure Reason*

## Introduction

The initiative to publish Polish translations of Kant's works originated with Henryk Struve (1840–1912). In the 1880s, Struve founded “Biblioteka Filozoficzna,” where he published translations of the works of Plato and other world philosophers. Information about this entered world circulation somewhat later thanks to Struve, who reported it at the International Philosophical Congress in Geneva in 1904. In a paper he prepared, Struve communicated, *inter alia*, that “Biblioteka” had already published Polish translations of the works of Xenophon, Plato, Gołuchowski, and Kant.<sup>1</sup>

In the matter of translating Kant's works, Struve first approached Władysław Weryho. In fact, he wanted Weryho to become his collaborator and to pursue further ideas along with him. Translations of Kant's works were to appear alternately in the “Biblioteka Filozoficzna” and in a publishing series at *Przegląd Filozoficzny*. This idea fell through on account of the lack of sufficient funds at the time and therefore inability on the part of *Przegląd Filozoficzny* to afford to carry out extensive activities. “Biblioteka Filozoficzna”, in turn, thanks to the subsidies received from the Mianowski Fund, functioned perfectly well for many years. Struve, however, needed organisational support. He was not afraid of censorship or lack of funds to publish more translations. An efficient team had to be formed. It was then that an agreement was reached between three scholars: Struve, Weryho, and Twardowski, who planned to begin with the translation of four of Kant's key treatises: *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, *Critique of Pure Reason*, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* and *Critique of Practical Reason*. The plan was ambitious. Struve, Weryho, and Twardowski, however, had concerns about whether it would be compatible with the scientific capabilities of the philosophical community. The concern was first and foremost to employ suitable translators, able not only to render the letter of the text correctly, but skilled

---

<sup>1</sup> Struve's text was published twice, the first time in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 18, the second time as a separate brochure in Berlin, in 1905. The text was published in Polish in 1907 in a translation by Kazimierz Król. See. Henryk Struve, *Filozofia polska w ostatnim dziesięcioleciu (1894-1904)*, transl. Kazimierz Król (Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff, 1907).

in scientific elaboration. Ideally, this should be a philosopher-Germanist. The difficult terminology of Kant's works did not initially encourage translation. However, efforts were made to create conditions for the potential translator to achieve the best possible result from his hard work. Both the editorial staff of "Biblioteka Filozoficzna" and *Przegląd Filozoficzny* had excellent technical personnel who made expert corrections and ensured that the translations corresponded to the original. All this was, of course, overseen by Struve. Twardowski provided an advisory voice. However, his participation was limited, as the Russian authorities did not allow the participation of outsiders under foreign jurisdiction. At that time, Twardowski was staying in Lviv, in the Austrian partition. Nevertheless, he kept an interest in the progress of the translation work and exercised substantive supervision. He received news of the progress through Weryho.

In the case of the *Prolegomena*, the choice of translator remained a mystery until the end. Struve did not want to reveal to whom he had entrusted the translation of this work. He himself had concerns about whether the choice of Romuald Grzymała-Piątkowski as translator would prove to be the right one. When the whole matter came to light, Twardowski strongly resisted, pointing to the translator's insufficient competence. Above all, he did not trust him with philosophical matters. A little later, it became clear that Twardowski's fears had unfortunately come true. A few years after the publication of Grzymała-Piątkowski's translation in the pages of *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, a dispute arose between Twardowski and Struve and his Lviv envoy, Hersz Bad.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> We gave a more detailed account of these complexities associated with the first Polish translation of Kant's *Prolegomena* in a monograph, entitled *Spory wokół polskich przekładów dzieł Immanuela Kanta z lat 1795-1918. Część pierwsza. Polemiki wokół dawnych polskich przekładów Kantowskich Prolegomenów do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka* [Disputes around Polish translations of Immanuel Kant's works from 1795–1918. Part One. Polemics around old Polish translations of Kant's *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics That Will Be Able to Present Itself as a Science*] (Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut – Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe, 2015). The article presents a summary of the research published in this book. We omit the entire polemic and focus only on the genesis of the translation by Romuald Grzymała-Piątkowski.

## The beginnings of work on the first Polish translation of Immanuel Kant's *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*

Twardowski and Weryho expected more than a mere literal translation. They were also interested in its substantive elaboration. They were aware of the origins of Kant's work and feared that without the presentation of important information, the translator's work might prove to be no more than a technical achievement. Twardowski had a number of doubts from the outset. However, he did not voice them outright, as Struve was in charge of the whole undertaking. He was mainly interested in the technical side of publishing the work, but avoided matters of substance. Struve did not attempt to further explore the historical and substantive reasons for Kant's publication of his work. Nor did the translator. Struve knew Piątkowski as a skilled and philosophy-loving literary man. He trusted his knowledge of foreign languages. It was only in the course of the work on the translation that any difficulties were to become apparent.

Twardowski and Weryho knew that the philosophical community of Königsberg, Berlin, and other German scientific centres not only expected Kant to explain in a new publication his findings presented in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, but there were also fears that the work would be inaccessible and incomprehensible to most. Tales even circulated about a certain chance encounter between two of Kant's good friends. They were the mayor of Königsberg, Theodor Hoppel, and his friend Georg Johann Scheffner, an administrative official in Königsberg. Hoppel asked Scheffner the question: "Have you already read our friend Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and is it as obscure as others say?" The latter replied that he had not yet read it and would probably succumb to the popular opinion advising against reading Kant's work. He declared eagerly: "It is too high for me. What good will it do me to explore it."<sup>3</sup> Kant swiftly responded to the accusations made against him of vagueness of style and terminology. This happened at the instigation of his friends Markus Herz, Moses Mendelssohn, and Johann Georg Sulzer. They prompted Kant to

---

<sup>3</sup> See the letter from Hoppel to Scheffner of 17 July 1781, in: Theodor Gottlieb Hoppel, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 14 (Berlin: Reimer, 1827), 223.

add a popular and more comprehensible commentary to the *Critique of Pure Reason* in the form of *Prolegomena*.<sup>4</sup>

This brief story of the origin and publication of Kant's work was a warning to Twardowski. He immediately noticed that Struve and Piątkowski did not consider the genesis of the work when undertaking their translation. He pointed out this error to them. In addition to this, which Twardowski himself did not go into, Kant's work was supplemented by answers concerning terminological ambiguities raised against the *Critique of Pure Reason* by an "anonymous reviewer from Göttingen," to whose accusations Kant replied in one of the "Addenda." This matter was omitted by the translator and editors both in Piątkowski's translation (of 1902) and in a later translation by Benedict Bornstein (of 1818).<sup>5</sup>

But let us return to Piątkowski, who decided to accept the commission from Struve in 1898. In a "Note" from the editor of "Biblioteka Filozoficzna" we read:

[...] It was 15 years ago, right at the start of this publication, that I was seeking those willing to undertake the translation of this work. At the time, there were already a few able staff members who had begun the translation, but none of them brought the work further than the translation of the initial dozen or so pages. External circumstances and professional occupations were the main reasons for this unsatisfactory end to these endeavours. This work was finally accomplished by Prof. R. Piątkowski in Detroit, and thanks to his perseverance, and the assistance of the Mianowski Fund, we can now publish this work by Kant in our language.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> More broadly on this subject in R. Kuliniak, *Spory filozoficzne Christiana Garvego z Immanuelem Kantem. Cz. 1, Polemika wokół pierwszego wydania „Krytyki czystego rozumu”* (Kraków: Aureus, 2012).

<sup>5</sup> See Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka, Z dodaniem Słownika terminów filozoficznych, użytych w tym przekładzie*, transl. Romuald Piątkowski, ed. Henryk Struve (Warszawa: zapomoga Kasy Pomocy dla Osób, Pracujących na Polu Naukowym im. J. Mianowskiego, 1901). See also Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. Benedykt Bornstein (Warszawa: s.n., 1918).

<sup>6</sup> See Struve's comment in the "Note from the Editor of Biblioteka Filozoficzna", in: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. Romuald Piątkowski, ed. Henryk Struve, III–IV.

According to some accounts, the contract also included an assignment to translate the *Critique of Pure Reason*.<sup>7</sup> This seemed obvious from Struve's intentions. He wished to contribute urgently, even before his retirement, to the Polish popularisation of Kantian philosophy and to present two translations of Kant's main works to the philosophical community. Resistance from Twardowski, however, was becoming more resolute by the day. Struve even took offence at Twardowski when he learned of the objection. In the end, Twardowski yielded and decided not to interfere in the affairs of Struve and Piątkowski. He decided that he would observe the venture from the side. This was a very good attitude, as contact with aged Struve was already difficult at the time. It was impossible to convince Struve of his reasons, and communication was made no easier by his deafness. Also, the interpreter himself was not available. Piątkowski moved to the USA, where he was employed as a teacher at the St. Cyril and Methodius Polish Seminary in Orchard Lake, Michigan.<sup>8</sup> Both his translations were produced there. It took over three years for Piątkowski and Struve to publish the results of their work.

### Problems with the Polish translation of *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*

Piåtkowski's work on translations of Kant's works took more than three years. Right from the start, Piåtkowski encountered problems of a terminolog-

---

<sup>7</sup> This results from determinations in: *Encyklopedia polskiej emigracji i Polonii*, ed. Kazimierz Dopierała (Toruń: Oficyna Wydawnicza Kucharski, 2005), vol. 4, 57. From R.G. Piåtkowski's biography, we can infer, *inter alia*, that in the "Orchard Lake School Archives" [State of Michigan, USA] they are preserved under Ref. I. 100: "Diariusz prof. R. Piåtkowskiego" (manuscript), sign. I. 101: "Kosmografia", 1919–1920, sign. I. 102–110, "Korespondencja" (2,000 letters), sign. I. 111: "Krytyka czystego rozumu' E. Kanta (tłumaczenie, rkp)". Similar information is also given by Andrzej Brożek in "Piåtkowski Romuald Grzymała", in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Kraków: Ossolineum, 1981), 18–19.

<sup>8</sup> Orchard Lake Schools in Michigan is home to St. Cyril and Methodius Seminary. It was founded on 4 January 1879 with the permission of Pope Leo XIII after an earlier petition by Fr Leopold Moczygemba. The seminary was founded by Fr Józef Dąbrowski. He was its first rector and founder in 1885 of the Scientific Institutes. See in more detail: Thomas Lindsay Baker, *Historia najstarszych polskich osad w Ameryce*, transl. Arkadiusz Bryczkowski (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1981).

ical nature. It was clear that he was not fully prepared for the task set by Struve. And despite his best efforts, things were going sluggishly. Piątkowski did not have a perfect command of German. He was far more proficient in English. He was mainly known for editing the periodical "Niedziela," in which he published his political and social columns. One could call him a lover of philosophy, but less a philosopher, and even less an expert on Kant's philosophy.

Before Piątkowski, as his principal was well aware, many had attempted to deal with Kant's works. None of them, however, took any meaningful step in this direction. Things usually ended up with only a few pages of attempts at translation. Most potential translators gave up, unable to cope with the demanding task. Struve began to lose hope in the success of this venture. He realised that Piątkowski might not be able to manage Kant's works. Besides, in the USA, Piątkowski was left all on his own with Kant's work, for the translation of which he had no real idea. He was without any good dictionary of Kant's philosophy at his disposal. Rudolf Eisler's first Kantian dictionary appeared only a few years later.<sup>9</sup> Nor did he have other tools comparable to contemporary Kantian compendia.<sup>10</sup> Let us add that a Polish Kantian dictionary to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, in an expanded form, regrettably unfinished, was attempted only after the Second World War by Roman Witold Ingarden to accompany his translation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The editors of "Biblioteka Klasyków Filozofii" strongly objected to the inclusion of such a dictionary in the translation. Irena Krońska, Tadeusz Kotarbiński, and, in particular, Adam Schaff, who supervised all the publishing work on the part of the communist authorities, stymied the plans that Ingarden was trying to realise.<sup>11</sup>

But let us return to the problems encountered by Piątkowski. The work of translating the *Prolegomena* was not an easy one. Piątkowski himself, in the

---

<sup>9</sup> *Kant-Lexikon. Nachschlagewerk zu Kants sämtlichen Schriften, Briefen und handschriftlichem Nachlass*, ed. Rudolf Eisler (Berlin: E.S. Mittler & Sohn, 1930).

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., the most recent edition of *Kant-Lexikon: Studienausgabe*, ed. Marcus Willaschek et al. (Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2017).

<sup>11</sup> Roman W. Ingarden, *Uwagi w sprawie polskiej terminologii dla tłumaczenia „Krytyki czystego rozumu” Kanta* [Notes on Polish terminology in the translation of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason"], Scientific Archives of PAN and PAU in Kraków, typescript, c. 27 and manuscript c. 23, j. 27. Cf. also Roman W. Ingarden, *Polska terminologia filozoficzna do Kanta (fragment)* [Polish philosophica terminology for Kant (excerpt)], (microfilm, 51 frames), Scientific Archives of PAN and PAU in Kraków, No. 7, file 27.

“Translator’s Foreword,” informs the reader of this fact. He complains that it was impossible to produce a literal translation, but only an interpretation that does not adhere strictly to Kant’s terminology. Piątkowski clearly failed to handle the philosophical text. On top of this, he could not grasp the sense of the entire content and did not write a meaningful introduction. The difficulties piled up. Piątkowski later admitted:

What I aimed at in this translation was what every translation should be about, namely: to render the author’s thoughts as accurately as possible while preserving the purity of the mother tongue. The difficulty of understanding Kant’s works is well known; his language was once called “lingua franca” owing to this difficulty. But it is not language alone that must be borne in mind here; the difficulties of translation arise from the extraordinary subtlety of thought in Kant’s critical studies. For this reason, the work of translating his works requires great attention, concentration and caution in order to penetrate the finest shades of his thought and not to lapse into error.<sup>12</sup>

Unfortunately, Piątkowski, contrary to his assurances about the precautions he had taken, continued to make an increasing number of mistakes. He was not entirely cognisant of what he was doing. The lack of discussion of the translation exacerbated these problems. However, he could not let Struve’s trust down. The latter, in turn, wanted to support the desperate Piątkowski and persuaded him to start confronting his own text not only with the original German, but also with translations of the *Prolegomena* into other languages. Despite his knowledge of English and a good grasp of other languages, this did not yield the expected results. Involved in political and social affairs, he rarely devoted time to Kantian matters. After more than a year of work, he was already feeling resigned to the point where he wanted to renege on his promise to Struve. The fiasco of the project hung in the balance. Struve, however, was not discouraged. He ultimately persuaded Piątkowski to

---

<sup>12</sup> Romuald Piątkowski, “Wstęp tłumacza” [“Translator’s Foreword”], in: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. R. Piątkowski, ed. H. Struve, XIII.



try to revise what he had done so far, in the hope that things would lighten up and move in the right direction.

### Romuald Piątkowski's confrontations

At the end of 1899, Piątkowski finally acted on Struve's suggestion and headed to American libraries and bookstores to acquire translations of the *Prolegomena* into other languages.<sup>13</sup> Specifically, he found French translations by Clode-Joseph Tissot from 1865.<sup>14</sup> However, this did not help Piątkowski. He was still lacking orientation in terminology. Tissot's French translation further exacerbated doubts about the proper grasp and rendering in Polish of the terms and concepts of Kantian philosophy. Piątkowski, moreover, procured other translations of Kant's works by Tissot. However, they were of little use. He trudged with difficulty through the French translations of Kant's subsequent works: *Critique de la raison pure* (Paris 1836), *Principes métaphysiques de la morale* (Paris 1840), or *Logique* (Paris 1840). Equally, another French translation of the *Prolegomena* was of little help, the 1891 translation prepared by students of the Paris Ecole Normale Supérieure under the direction of Georges Lyon<sup>15</sup> proving even more difficult than the Tissot translation.

Piątkowski expected to get slightly more information from British translations. He reached for John Richardson's 1818 translation.<sup>16</sup> However, this was hardly the best move. Uncertainties continued to increase. Still worse was the situation with Thomas Kongsmill Abbott's translation. Piątkowski later wrote that Abbott had translated Kant's *Prolegomena* in 1873,<sup>17</sup> but sources say that

---

<sup>13</sup> We have already written about this in *Spory wokół polskich przekładów dzieł Immanuela Kanta z lat 1795-1918, 72-74*. Owing to the importance of the problem, we have included the text originally published in our book after revisions to this article.

<sup>14</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolégomènes à toute métaphysique future qui aura le droit se présenter comme science*, traduction par Clode-Joseph Tissot (Paris: Librairie philosophique de Ladrance, 1865).

<sup>15</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolégomènes à toute métaphysique future qui aura le droit se présenter comme science*, traduction par Georges Lyon (Paris: Hachette, 1891).

<sup>16</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, transl. J. Richardson (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1818).

<sup>17</sup> Piątkowski, "Wstęp tłumacza" ["Translator's Foreword"], XII.

in 1873 only his translation of Kant's works in the area of practical philosophy and ethics was published.<sup>18</sup> One must believe Piątkowski, however, for at this point he was desperately looking for a way out of an awkward situation. He relied on very dubious assumptions, mainly his own. His intuition, much needed at that moment, failed him. The situation was even worse after reading Ernest Belford Bax's 1883 translation.<sup>19</sup> The sense of confusion was completed by the 1889 translation by John Pentland Mahaffy and John Henry Bernard.<sup>20</sup> The "Addendum" and the individual chapters from the *Critique of Pure Reason* published in this edition proved only partially helpful. Piątkowski made attempts to acquire a nineteenth-century Latin translation of the *Prolegomena*, prepared by Ferdinand Born. However, in spite of his many efforts and endeavours, he was not able to obtain this translation.

It was not the right time to pursue further research. Piątkowski had to finish his translation. He indeed had very little time left. At this stage, one more option was available to him. He could once again turn to the German editions. He found the German editions of the *Prolegomena* particularly valuable. These included Benno Erdmann's Leipzig edition of 1878<sup>21</sup>, "preceded by a scholarly treatise."<sup>22</sup> What is more, Piątkowski mentioned the Rosenkranz and Schubert editions.<sup>23</sup> It must also be added that, despite other problems, Piątkowski chose to offer some criticism of the German translations. His greatest objections were to the Leipzig edition, published in the Reclam Universal Library, and edited by Karl Schultz.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> *Kant's Theory of Ethics: Or Practical Philosophy*, transl. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott (Green: Longmans, 1873).

<sup>19</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Kant's Prolegomena and Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*, transl. Ernest Belford Bax (London: George Bell and Sons, 1883).

<sup>20</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Kant's Critical Philosophy for English Readers: For English Readers*, transl. John Pentland Mahaffy, John Henry Bernard (London: Macmillan & Co., 1889).

<sup>21</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, ed. Benno Erdmann (Leipzig: Verlag von Leopold Voss, 1878).

<sup>22</sup> Piątkowski, "Wstęp tłumacza" ["Translator's Foreword"], XII.

<sup>23</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können, Logik*, in: *Immanuel Kants Sammtliche Werke*, ed. Karl Rosenkranz, Friedrich W. Schubert, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Leopold Voss, 1838).

<sup>24</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, ed. Karl Schulz (Leipzig: Reclam, 1888).

The discussion of Kantian terminology and its accurate rendering in Polish went considerably too far. Piątkowski deviated from a literal translation of Kant's text. Confusion ensued, which meant that by the end of 1899 the translation was in total disarray. Yet, Piątkowski mobilised himself and completed the work. He accomplished the task, but the final translation was not quite faithful to the original. He thought that the philosophical community would accept the translation and find it to be good. He hoped that the mistakes he had made would be forgiven.

### Henryk Struve's editorial struggle with the manuscript of Romuald Piątkowski's translation of the *Prolegomena*

Grzymała-Piątkowski completed work on the translation and sent the text he had drafted to Struve. In his capacity as editor of "Biblioteka Filozoficzna," Struve decided that the work was not ready for print. Piątkowski's translation made an impression of a rough draft. It was not suitable for publication. Nevertheless, Struve began his editorial work. He was anxious to quickly correct Piątkowski's text and publish it. Thus, the editorial struggle with the translator's manuscript began. Struve placed the matter in the hands of his technical editors. These included in particular Adolf Tyszko, who was fluent in German and a member of the Warsaw Scientific Society and the Polish Philosophical Society in Lviv. Tyszko was a very meticulous person. He fulfilled the function of "text corrector" in Struve's department. He was extremely thorough and factual. Every text intended for publication passed through his hands. Another person who assisted Struve was Roman Ignacy Pleniewicz, a Polish literary historian, writer, member of the Warsaw Scientific Society, and encyclopaedist. In his scholarly work, he was concerned with the history of literature of the Polish Renaissance, the history of education, and didactics in general. He wrote on the subject of the teacher's tasks in elementary education, prepared the curriculum for teaching the history of Polish literature at the secondary school level, and pointed out the necessity of teaching classical languages in secondary education. Also, Pleniewicz collected material for a historical monograph on the Kronenberg Commercial School. He as-

sisted Struve with corrections from German as well as Polish. It is fair to say that he provided Tyszka with assistance in resolving difficult linguistic issues and helped to improve many of the intricate sentences in this work. The two formed a harmonious team.

The work on Piątkowski's translation was not easy. First of all, the "Translator's Foreword" had to be supplemented with issues related to the "Word from the Editor." This was personally handled by Struve. The most important task, however, rested with Tyszko. His task was to confront every sentence in Piątkowski's translation with the German original, and then to propose corrections that the translator could accept.

In many instances, Piątkowski remained adamant. He did not accept Tyszko's good advice. For example, Tyszko proposed a unification of philosophical terminology, which had to be in line with all previous publications of the Biblioteka Filozoficzna.<sup>25</sup> Tyszko drew on the editions of the Reclam publishing house. Piątkowski's position, based on his library searches, was that the French and British translators had a much easier task than he did. They dealt with it in a "legitimately grammatical" way, translating "a pronoun by means of another pronoun." What they did was to appropriately match the "pronoun to a specific noun," which made the text easier to read without having to refer to and compare it with the original. In the case of the Polish translation, matters were more complicated. Proceeding in an analogous fashion was out of the question. A Polish translation was not possible without breaking the rules of the syntax of our language. Instead of "using pronouns," Piątkowski preferred to "repeat the noun itself."<sup>26</sup> He could not cope with the intricacy and length of Kant's sentences. He usually decomposed them into "a greater number of self-contained sentences," which Tyszko refused to accept.<sup>27</sup>

A further problem for Piątkowski was that his translation lacked a "Glossary of Terms" with the relevant German terms.<sup>28</sup> This was handled by Struve

---

<sup>25</sup> Henryk Struve, "Od Redaktora «Biblioteki filozoficznej»" ["From the Editor of the «Philosophical Library»"], in: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. R. Piątkowski, ed. H. Struve, IV.

<sup>26</sup> Ibidem, XIV.

<sup>27</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>28</sup> See "Słownik terminów użytych w przekładzie *Prolegomenów* Kanta wraz z ich odpowiednimi terminami niemieckimi" ["Glossary of terms used in the translation of Kant's

personally together with Tyszko. However, the dictionary was not fine-tuned. In many places it was even mistaken. For instance, the German term “*Anschauung*” (Eng. view) was replaced by the Polish word “*pogląd*” (Eng. opinion).<sup>29</sup>

The enormity of the problems in editing Piątkowski’s translation led Struve to question if the text of the translation could be printed. He feared criticism from his colleagues. He knew that Twardowski would not accept a bad translation. Nor could he count on the support of Weryho, who was intransigent even in academic matters. The situation that had developed did not inspire optimism. Only Piątkowski felt content with what he accomplished. He remained in the USA awaiting the publication of his work.

## Conclusion

In the end, Piątkowski’s translation did appear in print. The translator benefited from the support provided by the editors of the Biblioteka Filozoficzna and introduced the most necessary corrections. In his “Preface,” Struve wrote of Piątkowski’s translation:

[...] this translation, like the original, does not read lightly, but demands intense attention and a proper insight into the content of the views presented. Those who find this intensity of thought intolerable, who require philosophy to speak in the language of a novel, should steer clear of Kant. To them, it should be known what Kant himself said about those who do not wish to take the trouble of properly understanding his critical research in order to arrive at metaphysics, namely, that it is not, after all, necessary for everyone to occupy himself with metaphysics, that there are talented people, distinguished in other scientific fields, who nevertheless have no aptitude for metaphysics, and that they should thus leave it in peace and occupy themselves with other pursuits. May those who do not wish to take the trouble to penetrate Kant’s intricate research to lay the foundations of meta-

---

Prolegomena with their corresponding German terms”], in: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. R. Piątkowski, ed. H. Struve, 161–166.

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem, 163.

physics do the same for us. Let them not read it, whether in translation or not, but let them at the same time renounce all pretence to philosophy.<sup>30</sup>

This was, of course, a kind of a justification. Struve was aware of the difficulties that the reader might experience when embarking on reading the first Polish translation of the *Prolegomena*. He was well aware that the language used by the translator was neither light nor elegant and required prior philosophical knowledge. Probably for this reason, anticipating the possibility of future critical reviews of this publication, he aimed to pre-emptively neutralize the objections of potential critics. He believed that they should first try to confront the “letter” of Kant’s texts themselves. Struve believed that the priority of Polish translations of Kant’s works should be accuracy and fidelity to thought, and only secondarily accessibility. The latter characteristic, in his opinion, marked the French translation of the *Prolegomena* and the Russian translation by Vladimir Solovyov, which appeared in Moscow in 1889. As he himself noted: “they could not serve as a model for the Polish translator,” for they treated Kant’s philosophy in an overly superficial manner.<sup>31</sup> Struve, on the other hand, was concerned with providing the Polish reader with philosophical terminology. For this reason, he made the primary aim of the Polish translation of the *Prolegomena* to support the further critical development of philosophical thought among new readers.<sup>32</sup>

Piątkowski’s translation was not met with harsh criticism until several years later. It was initiated by Twardowski, who urged Hersz Bad to join the polemic.<sup>33</sup> Twardowski refrained from criticism for some time so as not to offend Struve and to allow Piątkowski’s work to adapt. Twardowski hoped that the philosophical community itself would verify the whole thing. As it turned out, however, our Kant experts became strangely silent. Perhaps this was

---

<sup>30</sup> Henryk Struve, “Od Redaktora «Biblioteki filozoficznej»” [“From the Editor of the «Philosophical Library»”], V–VI.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, V.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>33</sup> See the polemic between Bad and Struve: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 10 (1907): 74–94 (Hersz Bad’s review) and *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 10 (1907): 218–227 (Henryk Stuve’s reply). Further polemic: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 11 (1908): 35–46. This polemic is discussed more broadly in *Spory wokół polskich przekładów dzieł Immanuela Kanta z lat 1795–1918*.

through respect for Struve. Because of his position and age, no one wished to offend him. Nevertheless, Piątkowski's translation proved not to be outstanding. Twardowski later insisted to Hersz Bad that his criticism be substantive and sharp. He thereby wanted to force the Polish philosophical community to prepare a new translation of the *Prolegomena*. It was in Benedict Bornstein that he saw the only expert on Kant capable of this task. It took almost eighteen years, however, for Polish philosophy to finally receive a second translation of the *Prolegomena*.

## References

- Bad Hersz. 1907. [Review]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 10: 74–94.
- Baker Thomas Lindsay. 1981. *Historia najstarszych polskich osad w Ameryce*, transl. Arkadiusz Bryczkowski. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Brożek Andrzej. 1981. "Piątkowski Romuald Grzymała". In: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. Kraków: Ossolineum 18–19.
- Dopierała Kazimierz (ed.) 2005. *Encyklopedia polskiej emigracji i Polonii*. Toruń: Oficyna Wydawnicza Kucharski.
- Eisler Rudolf (ed.) 1930. *Kant-Lexikon*. Berlin: E.S. Mittler & Sohn.
- Hippel Theodor Gottlieb. 1827. *Sämtliche Werke*. Berlin: Reimer.
- [Ingarden Roman W.] *Polska terminologia filozoficzna do Kanta (fragment)*. (microfilm, 51 frames). Archiwum Nauki PAN i PAU w Krakowie. No.7, file 27.
- [Ingarden Roman W.] *Uwagi w sprawie polskiej terminologii dla tłumaczenia Krytyki czystego rozumu Kanta*. Archiwum Nauki PAN i PAU w Krakowie. Typescript. c. 27 oraz manuscript c. 23. j. 27.
- Kant Immanuel. 1818. *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, transl. J. Richardson. London: Simpkin and Marshall.
- Kant Immanuel. 1838. *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können und Logik*. w: *Immanuel Kants Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Karl von Rosenkranz, Friedrich W. Schubert. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Verlag von Leopold Voss.
- Kant Immanuel. 1840. *Logique*, transl. Clode-Joseph Tissot. Paris: Librairie philosophique de Ladrangé.
- Kant Immanuel. 1840. *Principes métaphysiques de la morale*, transl. Clode-Joseph Tissot. Paris: Librairie philosophique de Ladrangé.
- Kant Immanuel. 1865. *Prolégomènes à toute métaphysique future qui aura le droit se présenter comme science*, transl. Clode-Joseph Tissot. Paris: Librairie philosophique de Ladrangé.



- Kant Immanuel. 1878. *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird Auftreten können*, ed. Benno von Erdmann. Leipzig: Verlag von Leopold Voss.
- Kant Immanuel. 1883. *Kant's Prolegomena and Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*, transl. with a biography and introduction by Ernest Belfort Bax. London: George Bell and Sons.
- Kant Immanuel. 1888. *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, ed. Karl von Schulz. Leipzig: Reclam.
- Kant Immanuel. 1889. *Kant's Critical Philosophy for English Readers: For English Readers*, transl. John Pentland Mahaffy, John Henry Bernard. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Kant Immanuel. 1891. *Prologomènes à toute métaphysique future qui aura le droit se présenter comme science*, transl. Georges Lyon. Paris: Hachette.
- Kant Immanuel. 1901. *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka, Z dodaniem Słownika terminów filozoficznych, użytych w tym przekładzie*, transl. Romuald Piątkowski, ed. Henryk Struve. Warszawa: zapomoga Kasy Pomocy dla Osób, Pracujących na Polu Naukowym im. J. Mianowskiego.
- Kant Immanuel. 1918. *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. Benedykt Bornstein. Warszawa: s.n.
- Kant's Theory of Ethics: Or Practical Philosophy*. 1873. transl. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. Green: Longmans.
- Kuliniak Radosław, Dorota Leszczyna. 2015. *Spory wokół polskich przekładów dzieł Immanuela Kanta z lat 1795-1918. Część pierwsza. Polemiki wokół dawnych polskich przekładów Kantowskich Prolegomenów do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut – Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe.
- Kuliniak Radosław. 2012. *Spory filozoficzne Christiana Garvego z Immanuelem Kantem. Cz. 1, Polemika wokół pierwszego wydania „Krytyki czystego rozumu”*. Kraków: Aureus.
- Piątkowski Romuald. 1901. “Wstęp tłumacza”. In: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. Romuald Piątkowski, ed. Henryk Struve. Warszawa: zapomoga Kasy Pomocy dla Osób, Pracujących na Polu Naukowym im. J. Mianowskiego.
- “Słownik terminów użytych w przekładzie Prolegomenów Kanta wraz z ich odpowiednimi terminami niemieckimi”. In: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka*, transl. R. Piątkowski, ed. H. Struve. Warszawa: zapomoga Kasy Pomocy dla Osób, Pracujących na Polu Naukowym im. J. Mianowskiego, 161–166.
- Struve Henryk. 1901. “Od Redaktora «Biblioteki filozoficznej»”. In: Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako*



*nauka*, transl. Romuald Piątkowski, ed. Henryk Struve. Warszawa: zapomoga Kasy Pomocy dla Osób, Pracujących na Polu Naukowym im. J. Mianowskiego, III-IV.

Struve Henryk. 1907. [A response to Hersz Bad's allegations]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 10(2): 218–227.

Struve Henryk. 1907. *Filozofia polska w ostatnim dziesięcioleciu (1894-1904)*, transl. Kazimierz Król. Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff.

Willaschek Marcus, Jürgen Stolzenberg, Georg. Mohr, Stefano Bacin (eds.) 2017. *Kant-Lexikon: Studienausgabe*. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter.